In *Demonstratives* (1977/1989), David Kaplan states the following thesis:

**Fixity Thesis (a corollary of Direct Reference):** The semantic value of an indexical is fixed solely by the context of the actual speech act, and cannot be affected by any logical operators.

‘Indexicals’ here are those items whose semantic values are determined by the context of utterance. Kaplan’s examples include *I, you, this, that, here, now, yesterday, tomorrow, actually*.

Philippe Shlensker (2003) argues that some indexicals may be sensitive to contexts other than the context of the actual speech act. Namely, in the case of indirect speech, certain lexical items can have their value determined by the context of the reported utterance. This leads Schlenker to his analysis of speech verbs as quantifiers over contexts. Those indexicals that refer to such embedded contexts violate the Fixity Thesis, as stated by Kaplan, and thus qualify as “monsters”, according to Kaplan’s definition.

In the cases discussed by Schlenker, particular indexicals are lexically specified as (potential) monsters. Certain indexicals (like the Amharic translation of *I*) can play this role, others (like the English *I*), cannot. In this paper, another kind of phenomenon is studied, namely reported speech in Russian employing the so called citation particles, where it is the embedding construction that determines whether indexicals inside it are allowed to refer to the context of a reported utterance. So, while linguistic entities described by Schlenker are monsters in themselves, citation particles in Russian set up playgrounds where ordinary indexicals behave monstrously.

I look at the following components of the context: speaker and addressee, as witnessed by the personal pronouns, time, as witnessed by tense and temporal adverbials like *today* etc. (and Russian translations thereof), location, as witnessed by adverbials like *here*, and speaker’s evaluation attitude, as witnessed by epithets.

I am going to make repeated use of the following example: on Tuesday Andrey, being for some reason enraged with Borya, tells Borya’s friend Vasya\(^1\) while talking to him at school:

\(^{1}\)A(A), B(B) and V(B) are the first three letters of the Russian alphabet.
(1) *Ja zavtra etogo ubljudka zdes’ vstreču i*
I.Nom tomorrow this bastard.Acc here meet.Fut.1Sg and
*nab’ju emu mordu*
beat him up.Fut.1Sg

‘I will meet this bastard here tomorrow and beat him up (lit. beat him in the face).’

On Thursday Vasya visits Borya at his home and reports Andrey’s words to him.

1 **Background: direct and indirect speech in Russian**

In order to express someone else’s words, a Russian speaker can employ either direct quotation or an indirect speech construction.\(^2\)

Direct quotations have the following properties (exactly like their English counterparts):

1. The words of another speaker are reproduced literally (exception: if the reported speech was performed in a different language, it is translated into Russian as faithfully as possible).

2. As the result of 1, all the indexicals present in the embedded speech are interpreted with respect to the context of the reported utterance.

3. No complementizer is used.

4. Quotations are used not just for speech reports, but also to describe propositional attitudes. In such cases, the embedded sentence represents the “internal speech” of the subject.

Thus, in our model situation, Borya can tell Vasya:

(2) *Andrej mne skazal: “Ja zavtra etogo ubljudka zdes’ vstreču i nab’ju emu mordu”*
A. to.me said I tomorrow this bastard here meet.Fut.1Sg and beat.Fut.1Sg him up

Andrey told me: “I will meet this bastard tomorrow and beat him up”

Indirect speech has the following properties:

\(^2\)So far as I know, all languages have direct quotation constructions. Indirect speech, on the other hand, is not universal. Alkhovenvald (2004, p. 132) states:

... some language have direct speech quotations as the only option. This is the case in Quaza (van der Voort 2000: 291), Dyirbal and a few other Australian languages, and a few languages from Papua New Guinea (see examples in Larson 1984: 367-8).

Hardman (1986, p. 120) makes a similar claim for Aymara.
1. There is more freedom as to how closely the other speaker’s words are reproduced.

2. (a) Personal pronouns, indexicals designating location, epithets are used relative to the context of the main utterance.

(b) Tenses are used relative to the context of the reported utterance (Kusumoto 1999).³

(c) Indexical temporal adverbs are used relative to the context of the main utterance. But there is a further restriction:

(d) Temporal adverbs can only be used when their meaning is consistent with the morphological marking of the verb. (This is what prevents the use of včera ‘yesterday’ in (3) below.)⁴

3. The complementizer čto is obligatory in the written language; in the spoken language it may sometimes be omitted.

In the model situation, Borya can say:

(3) Andrej mne skazal, čto on na sljedujuschij den’ tebja tam
A. to.me said that he next.day you there
ustreti i nab’jet tebe mordu
meet.Fut.3Sg and beat.Fut.3Sg you up

A. told me that he would meet you there the next day and beat you up.

This is the only variant he can use. In particular, the verbs in the embedded sentence have to be in the future tense, and neither the adverb včera ‘yesterday’ nor zavtra ‘tomorrow’ can be used. The personal pronouns, the (subject) person markers on the verbs and the indexical adverb of location tam ‘there’ are the only options. Also, the epithet ubljudok ‘bastard’ is unacceptable (at least if we assume that Vasya is Borya’s friend and has no reason to use the epithet to express his own evaluation).

2 Citation particles

In addition to simple direct and indirect speech constructions, Russian has three particles that mark speech by another person: mol, de and deskat’.⁵ I will treat the particles as synonymous for the purposes of this paper. (See Rakhilina 1996, p. 300, for an account of the distinction between mol and deskat’.) As a reference point for English speakers, it can be noted that in certain dialects and genres of spoken English like serves a similar function (although, as far as I know, like cannot introduce mixed contexts, to be discussed below).

³In contrast to this, in relative clauses tense is determined by the time of utterance.
⁴Some of my informants accepted certain examples violating this rule, but an overwhelming majority rejected them.
⁵All three particles are historically derived from verbs of speech (see Vasm 1964–1973). In particular, deskat’ is composed of de, itself from *dějati, and a shortened form of skazat’. 
The particles come at the beginning of a reported speech clause or as second position clitics.

Citation particles can be used in a dependent clause with a verb of speech (or similar) in the main clause. They can also be used in the subsequent independent sentences to indicate continuation of reported speech.6 (They cannot be considered reportative evidentials, since the source of reported speech has to be indicated somewhere in the text; otherwise the sentence containing the particle is ungrammatical. Aikhenvald (2004, p. 177) uses the term ‘quotative’ for this kind of markers.)

Both typical direct speech examples and typical indirect speech remain grammatical when citation particles are added.

(4) Andrej mne skazal, mol, ja zavtra etogo ubljudka zdes’
A. to.me said Cit I tomorrow this bastard here 
vstreču i nab’ju emu mordu
meet.Fut.1Sg and beat.Fut.1Sg him up
Andrey told me, mol, I will meet this bastard tomorrow and beat him up.

(5) Andrej mne skazal, četo on, mol, na slijedujushchij den’ tebja
A. to.me said that he Cit next.day you 
tam vstretit i nab’jet tebe mordu
there meet.Fut.3Sg and beat.Fut.3Sg you up
A. told me that, mol, he would meet you the next day and beat you up.

However there are intermediate cases, where the embedded clause has some properties of direct speech but some properties of indirect speech.

• It is possible for a clause marked by a citation particle to be introduced with a complementizer but have all the demonstratives evaluated with respect to the context of the reported utterance.

(6) Andrej mne skazal, četo, ja, mol, zavtra etogo ubljudka
A. to.me said that I Cit tomorrow this bastard 
zdes’ vstreču i nab’ju emu mordu
here meet.Fut.1Sg and beat.Fut.1Sg him up
Andrey told me that, mol, I will meet this bastard here tomorrow and beat him up.

• It is also possible for such a clause to lack the complementizer but have demonstratives interpreted with respect to the context of the main utterance. (This is much less surprising: citation particles are characteristic of informal style, where the complementizer is not obligatory anyway.)

6Schlenker (2003) describes similar behaviour for German Konjunktiv I and Ewe logophoric pronouns. One can also compare this to the well-known phenomenon of modal subordination.
Some demonstratives may refer to the context of the main utterance while some refer to the context of the reported utterance.

In (8), personal pronouns are used relative to the top-level utterance, while the epithet and the temporal adverbial ‘tomorrow’ behave in a ‘monster-like’ manner, relative to the context of the reported utterance. Since this particular kind of sentences is perhaps the most interesting phenomenon discussed in this paper, I want to supplement my artificial example by some naturally occurring ones, taken from the Russian National Corpus (http://ruscorpora.ru):

In both examples, the time of the report is much later than the reported utterance, so the temporal adverbs only make sense if interpreted in a ‘monstrous’ fashion. At the same time, personal pronouns retain their reference to the context of the main utterance. (In (10) there is no speech verb, since this sentence is part of a longer reported passage.)

Certain restrictions apply:

• Demonstratives of the same type have to be used consistently. For example, one cannot use personal pronouns relative to conflicting contexts:
Andrej A. skazal, čto, mol, ya tebja vstreču
A. said that Cît I you meet.Fut.1Sg
*A. told me that, mol, I will meet you. (Ungrammatical with the required meaning in our standard situation)

Note that reference point for time adverbials should be considered a different parameter from the reference point for verbal tenses. (3) demonstrates that point.

- Some context parameters display ‘monstrous’ behaviour (referring to the context of a reported utterance) easier than others. There appears to be a hierarchy:

(12) personal pronouns, location adverbs > epithets, temporal indexical adverbs > tense

For items that stand higher on this hierarchy to demonstrate ‘monstrous’ behaviour in a given sentence, items lower on the hierarchy have to demonstrate it as well. In particular, the following example is ungrammatical (in our standard situation):?

(13) Andrej skazal, čto, mol, ja ego zdes' na sljeduščij den' vstreču
A. said that Cît. him here next day meet.Fut.1Sg
*A. said that, mol, I will meet him here the next day.

Tense should not probably be on the hierarchy at all; it is always used with respect to the context of the reported utterance.

3 Citation particles do not introduce direct quotation

One could try to argue that citation particles like mol do not pose a problem for Kaplan’s theory of indexicals, since they introduce, well, citations. Under this point of view, in examples where all the indexicals refer to the context of the reported utterance, like (4), we have direct quotation, and mixed examples like (8) demonstrate a patchwork of quotations and normal, non-monstrous indexicals. In this section, I provide arguments against this idea.

- In direct quotation, there is no requirement that the utterance cited form a complete sentence. For example, the utterance may be cut off:

---

7The judgement here is my own. Other informants’ judgements seem to confirm it, but are not robust enough. More checking is needed.
Vasja nachal govorit’: “Ja včera videl...”, i V. started speak.Inf I yesterday saw and vdrug zamolchal. suddenly went.silent
Vasya started talking: “Yesterday I saw...”, and suddenly went silent.

With citation particles, this is not possible, even if all the indexicals are used relative to the reported utterance context:

*Vasja nachal govorit’, mol, ja včera videl..., i V. started speak.Inf Cit I yesterday saw and vdrug zamolchal. suddenly went.silent
*”Vasya started talking, mol, yesterday I saw..., and suddenly went silent.

• Consistency. The fact that constructions employing citation particles obey certain regularities, such as those described in the previous section, shows that they have more structure than a random mixture of quoted words and indirect speech.

4 Analysis

In order to provide an analysis for indexicals in Russian, we represent context as a vector of parameters, including person information (which is itself a vector of the speaker and the addressee8), location (probably also orientation, so that the content of words like pravyj ‘right’ and levyj ‘left’ can be established), and evaluation standards. I will use functions speaker(c), addressee(c), location(c), world(c) and standards(c) to select individual components of the context vector. Time enters the context twice: as the reference point for tense morphemes and as the reference point for temporal adverbs. (In the global context, both positions have the same value.) I use functions timev(c) and timea(c), respectively, to select these components. Reference time for tense should occupy the first position in the context vector.

Linguistic expressions are interpreted with respect to a context. Non-indexical expressions make no use of the context parameters; indexicals refer to one or more components of the context vector:

\[
\begin{align*}
[ja]^{c,w} &= \text{speaker}(c) & \text{‘I’} \\
[ty]^{c,w} &= \text{addressee}(c) & \text{‘you’}
\end{align*}
\]

In indirect speech constructions, we need to separate the contribution of the speech verb and the contribution of its sentential complement (which may be with or without a citation particle). Every utterance creates a new context

8Both occupy one place in the context vector, because they can only vary together.
(I assume that there is a function context($e$) that, given an utterance event, returns its context). This new context is passed as an argument to the sentential complement.

We can express this as

\[
[SAY_e \phi]^{c,w} = 1 \text{ iff } [\phi(\text{context}(e))]^{c,w'} \text{ is true in all worlds } w' \text{ compatible with the claim made in } e
\]

Here $\phi$ is the sentential complement of the speech verb.

This sentential complement operates on two contexts: the top-level context of the sentence (supplied by the interpretation) and the context of a reported utterance (given to it as an argument). The sentential complement construction combines these two contexts into a mixed one and evaluates the embedded clause with respect to that mixed context. (I stipulate that the complementizer, if any, and the citation particle, if any, together form a syntactically atomic unit that takes the whole embedded clause in its scope.)

The complement with ordinary indirect speech takes the timev component of the reported utterance's context (which, as I postulated earlier, is the first element in the context vector); all the other context parameters are taken from the global context.

I use a function mix($i,c_1,c_2$) that forms a context by taking $i$ components from $c_1$ and the remaining components from $c_2$.

\[
[SAY_e \phi]^{c,w} = \lambda c'. \phi^{\text{mix}(1,c',c)}
\]

A complement with a citation particle takes $n$ ($1 \leq n \leq \text{length}(c)$) elements of the reported context. This rule allows for constructions where only tense demonstrates monstrous properties (with $n = 1$), where all indexicals do (with $n = \text{length}(c)$), or where only some types of indexicals are monstrous (the intermediate cases). I use the order of components in the context vector to encode the hierarchy of indexicals mentioned at the end of section 2.

\[
[(\text{cito} \phi)]^{c,w} = \lambda c'. \phi^{\text{mix}(i,c',c)}
\]

There are $\text{length}(c)$ homonymous particles mol$e$.

Note that explicit context variables are only needed to pass information from a speech verb to its sentential complement; at any point where indexicals are used, only one (perhaps mixed) context is operative. This context is determined at the border of an embedded clause. Indexicals themselves have no choice in selecting their reference point, unlike the items described in Schlenker’s article.

This analysis does not provide enough flexibility to handle predications with operators like $\text{sejács ‘now’}, \text{zdes ‘here’} \text{ or na samom dele ‘actually’}$. One can easily extend it with a 2-dimensional perspective, as in Kamp (1971). In the case of the temporal adverbs, however, it is possible to avoid double indexing, since there are already two time coordinates in our index: timea(c) and timev(c).

I assume that temporal adverbs take the clause they occur in into their scope. I also assume that the event variable corresponding to the main predicate of that clause is accessible to the adverbs (the precise machinery that makes this
possible does not concern me here). Temporal adverbs reset the value of time in their scope:

\[(20) \quad \lceil \text{sejčas} \phi \rceil \langle t_v, \ldots, t_a, \ldots \rangle, w = \lceil t_a \in \text{time}(e) \land \phi(e) \rceil \langle t_v, \ldots, t_a, \ldots \rangle, w \quad \text{‘now’}\]

Similarly, for \textit{segodnja} ‘today’ and \textit{včera} ‘yesterday’ (assuming that 1 day is a unit of time):

\[(21) \quad \lceil \text{segodnja} \phi \rceil \langle t_v, \ldots, t_a, \ldots \rangle, w = \lceil \text{time}(e) \cap \text{day}(t_a) \neq \emptyset \land \phi(e) \rceil \langle t_v, \ldots, t_a, \ldots \rangle, w \quad \text{‘today’} \]
\[(21) \quad \lceil \text{včera} \phi \rceil \langle t_v, \ldots, t_a, \ldots \rangle, w = \lceil \text{time}(e) \cap \text{day}(t_a - 1) \neq \emptyset \land \phi(e) \rceil \langle t_v, \ldots, t_a, \ldots \rangle, w \quad \text{‘yesterday’} \]

There is no corresponding solution for \textit{na samom dele} ‘actually’ or \textit{zdes} ‘here’, so one would still have to resort to the conventional 2-dimensional machinery to handle those.\(^9\)

If viewed as a fragment of Universal Grammar, the analysis does not handle monstrous lexical items discussed by Schlenker (2003). However, in my opinion, it can serve as a natural point in the space of possible theories, where subtler phenomena require more sophisticated machinery.

It would be interesting to look at similar constructions in other languages and see whether they observe the hierarchy of indexical parameters (section 2).
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